

REMARKS

In the Office Action of March 3, 2005, the Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 18-24, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of “Intermediaries: New Places for Producing and Manipulating Web Content,” by Barrett et al. (“Barrett”) in view of “How to Personalize the Web,” by Barrett et al. (“BMK”); and rejects claims 6-11, 15-17, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett, BMK, and U.S. Patent No. 5,752,022 to Chiu et al. (“Chiu”).

By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 22, 23, and 24 have been amended. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to more appropriately define the invention and claims 2-4, 9, 11, 22, 23, and 24 have been amended for form. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 6 can be found, for example, at page 16 of the originally filed specification and in blocks 508-514 of Fig. 5A. Additionally, by this Amendment, claims 15-20 and 27 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 21-26 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 18-24, and 27 stand rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett and BMK. The rejection of claims 18, 19, 20, and 27 is obviated by virtue of their cancellation. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-4 and 21-24.

Independent claim 1, as amended, is directed to an information retrieval system that serves to retrieve information requested by a client machine from a remote server via a network. The system includes an intermediate server coupled to a network, the intermediate server receiving requests and performing processing on responses to the requests before returning the responses to a client machine. The system further includes at least one third-party application plug-in installed on the intermediate server, the third-

party application plug-in filters the response to render at least one feature available at the client machine without counterpart plug-ins at the client machine. A history manager is operable on the intermediate server and stores results of historical requests from the client machine and provides the results of the historical requests to the client machine in response to a view history request from the client machine. The received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote server.

Applicants submit that Barrett and BMK, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in amended claim 1. For example, neither Barrett nor BMK discloses or suggests, as recited in claim 1, that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote server.

Barrett discloses an intermediary approach to manipulating web content using a proxy server. (Barrett, section 3 "Architecture"). Requests received at the intermediary follow the three steps discussed in section 3.2 of Barrett. These steps are:

- 1) The original request is compared with the rules for all Request Editors. The Request Editors whose rule conditions are satisfied by the request are allowed to edit the request in priority order.
- 2) The request that results from this Request Editor chain is compared with the rules for all Generators. The request is sent to the highest priority Generator whose rule is satisfied. If that Generator rejects the request, subsequent valid Generators are called in priority order until one produces a document.
- 3) The request and document are used to determine which Document Editors and Monitors should see the document on its way back to the original requester. The document is modified by each Document Editor whose rule conditions are satisfied in priority order. Monitors are also configured to monitor the document either (a) as it is produced

by the generator, (b) as it is delivered from the intermediary, or (c) after a particular Document Editor.

- 4) Finally, the document is delivered to the requester, which may be the browser if this is the first intermediary in the chain.

(Barrett, section 3.2). This disclosure of Barrett provides for a number of steps that are to be followed when handling requests. None of these steps, however, disclose or suggest, as recited in amended claim 1, that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote servers. If anything, Barrett teaches away from forwarding requests as recited in claim 1 as Barrett specifically discloses techniques for handling requests that are clearly different than those currently recited in claim 1.

The Examiner also relies on BMK in rejecting claim 1. In particular, the Examiner relies on BMK for the disclosure of a history manager. (Office Action, page 3). Applicants have reviewed BMK and submit that BMK fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Barrett. That is, BMK, as with Barrett, fails to disclose or suggest that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote server.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Barrett and BMK, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 2-4 and 21-24 based on Barrett and BMK under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 1.

Claims 6-11, 15-17, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett, BMK, and Chiu. The cancellation of claims 15-17 obviates the rejection of these claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 6-11, 25, and 26.

Claim 6 is directed to an intermediary server system that comprises a web server that receives requests for resources from client machines via a network and a HTTP handler operatively connected to said web server. The HTTP handler receives the requests for resources, modifies the requests when the requests are intended for remote servers, and forwards the modified requests for resources to remote servers. An HTML parser receives the resources supplied by the remote servers in response to the modified requests, and modifies the resources such that at least certain links contained therein are modified to be directed to an intermediary server system instead of remote server. A history manager provides resources that were previously requested by the client machine in response to a view history request received from the client machine. The HTTP handler determines that the requests are intended for the remote servers by assuming the requests are intended for the remote servers when the requests are not view history requests or login requests to the web server.

In rejecting claim 6, the Examiner relies on Barrett to disclose many of the features recited in claim 6, but relies on BMK to disclose the history manager of claim 6 and relies on Chiu to disclose aspects of the recited HTML parser relating to modifying resources such that at least certain links contained therein are modified to be directed to an intermediary server system instead of a remote server. (Office Action, page 9).

Barrett, BMK, and Chiu, either alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 6. In particular, none of these

references discloses or suggests an HTTP handler that determines that requests are intended for the remote servers by assuming the requests are intended for the remote servers when the requests are not view history requests or login requests to the web server. Barrett and BMK were previously discussed with regard to a related feature in claim 1. Based on similar rationale as that given for claim 1, Applicants submit that Barrett and BMK fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 6. The Applicants have reviewed Chiu and submit that Chiu similarly fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 6.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Barrett, BMK, and Chiu, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 6. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 is improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 7-11, 25, and 26 based on Barrett, BMK, and Chiu under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By:



Brian E. Ledell
Reg. No. 42,784

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800
Customer No.: 44987

Date: June 2, 2005